

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 are currently pending in the present patent application, with new claims 31 and 32 having been added through the above claim amendments.

In an Office Action mailed March 6, 2006, the Examiner noted that the application as filed included duplicate claims 24 and 25, with the Examiner designating the first two claims 24a and 25a and the second two 24b and 25b. Claims 24a and 25a have been cancelled and rewritten as new claims 31 and 32 to eliminate this erroneous inclusion of duplicate claim numbers. Thus, what the Examiner termed claims 24b and 25b remain in the application as claims 24 and 25. None of these amendments introduces any new matter into the application or changes the scopes of any these claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6-11, 13-23, currently pending claims 24 and 25, and claims 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0158614 A1 to Friel *et al.* ("Friel"). Claims 4, 5, current claims 31 and 32, and claims 28-29 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friel. With regard to claim 4, for example, the Examiner asserts that since a home network may include family photographic or some sort of video content that it would have been obvious to modify the system of Friel to download video or photographic content. The Examiner makes similar assertions regarding the navigational files recited in claim 5, 29, and 32.

Amended claim 1 recites, in part, a digital media player for a vehicle that comprises a mass storage device operable to store digital content and to provide the stored digital content and control circuitry coupled to the mass storage device. The control circuitry receives wired digital content from a home network with this wired digital content comprising at least one of video and photographic content.

Friel neither discloses nor suggests receiving and storing video and/or photographic content. Friel speaks only of audio content and different types of audio content from different sources. See, *e.g.*, paragraphs 57-65. The Examiner appears to assert that because video and/or photographic content is available from some of the content sources discussed in Friel, such as the Internet (see *e.g.*, paragraphs 32 and 46) and home network including a wireless LAN 44 and computer 45 (see paragraph 32), that it would have been obvious to download such content to the disclosed audio

device 50 of Friel. This is contrary to the express disclosure of Friel and any suggestions one skilled in the art would glean from that disclosure.

The audio device 50 of Friel is directed to an audio system for a vehicle as indicated by the title of the Friel reference. Friel speaks only in terms of audio data or audio content. Every instance of content in Friel is discussed as being audio content. This makes sense in the system of Friel since the disclosure is directed to audio content from various sources for use in a vehicle. Even in paragraph 73 of Friel where home stereo equipment is discussed, only “digital audio data” is contemplated, as further indicated the user of the term “home stereo system” and not the broader term “home theater system.” Further evidence of this is clear from paragraph 45 of Friel, in which a display screen for displaying several lines of text is disclosed. Such a display is not the type of display on which video, photographic, and navigational content could be displayed. This could in fact be said to teach away from downloading video or photographic content. Furthermore, there is no motivation or teaching to modify Friel to include video or photographic content.

For all these reasons, the combination of elements recited in amended claim 1 is allowable. Independent claims 10, 17, and 25 are allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. All dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the associated independent claim and due to the additional limitations added by each of these claims.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

The present patent application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further questions about the application, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at (425) 455-5575 to resolve the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP

Paul F. Rusyn

Registration No. 42,118

155 – 108th Avenue NE, Suite 350

Bellevue, WA 98004-5973

(425) 455-5575 Phone

(425) 455-5575 Fax

Correspondence to:
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Phone: (970) 898-3884